

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH: SUNDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1894—TWENTY PAGES.

PRICE, FIVE CENTS.

Roberts' Masterly Address.

Delivered at the Continental Market, Wednesday Evening.

THE PARTIES COMPARED.

DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN THEORIES OF GOVERNMENT. OUTLINED.

The Income Tax—Effects of McKinleyism—The Sugar Trust—Local Issues—Joseph F. Smith and Statehood—Rawlins' Work in Congress—The Church Property.

Following is the masterly address delivered by Hon. B. H. Roberts at the Continental Market last Wednesday evening, and which is worthy of careful perusal by all classes of citizens:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—The people of the United States are divided into two great political parties, each one of which asks the suffrage of a great people, and desire to be placed in charge of the administration of our government. There are those who are of the opinion that the differences which divide these parties are not very marked or great. I cannot subscribe to that opinion. The differences are very great, the issues between them are important, touching, as I believe, the very sphere of government, that is the purpose for which it exists. It is my desire to point this out to you. To begin with we must not deal with definitions. I shall undertake to give the Democratic idea of the proper sphere of government by reading to you a clause in the Declaration of Independence. That Declaration, you will remember, was written by the founder of the great Democratic party the immortal Thomas Jefferson. In that document occurs this language: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—among which is life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men." (Applause.)

That is the Democratic definition of the sphere of government. The same great writer, however, has said more than that upon the subject. It is generally believed that because Thomas Jefferson, at the time the Constitution of our country was being formulated by the great convention which drafted it, that he had little to do with defining its principles. This, however, is a mistake, for though he was absent in France, he was in close touch both with the American people and with the great convention—that is, he was in constant correspondence with such men as James Madison, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, Patrick Henry and others, and in one of his letters to James Madison he makes this remark concerning the government about to be formed: "Let us found a government where there shall be no extremely rich men and no abjectly poor ones." It seems to me that he

must have caught the spirit of that sentiment from the wise men who said, "Make me not rich, least I be proud; neither make me poor lest I steal." He desired in his great wisdom to be at an equal distance from these two extremes. If that is a good condition for an individual to be in, Jefferson seemed to be of the opinion that it would also be good for a nation to be in that condition. (Applause.) Continuing, he said: "Let us form a government upon the intelligence of the people; let us make laws where there shall be no government partisanship with favored classes." (Applause.) Let us protect all in life, liberty and property, and then say to every American citizen, with the gifts which God has given you, your brain, brawn and energy, work out your own fortune under a just government and equal laws. (Applause.) That is the definition, the Democratic definition of the mission, the duty and the sphere of government—to give peace and tranquility to society and to secure the rights and liberties of every individual in the state.

I have called your attention to the Democratic theory of the sphere of government. It must now be my duty to call your attention to the Republican theory. You will observe that I have gone beyond the time when our present constitution had its existence, and therefore you cannot in justice go back to the Democratic party. It will be equal to me to go back to the Republican theory of government and quote the sentiments of its founder. The founder of the Republican party, I trust that no Republican in his mind will say: "The Republican party had no existence until 1856, and therefore you cannot in justice go back to that time in speaking of Republican theories." Republican principles, however, were in existence before 1856, and I might ask the Republican raising Kochan who would call it a Republican party? I am following—I might ask him what is in a name? The thing we call a rose would smell as sweet by any other name, and the foulest stench though you would call it a rose or a hellhound would smell as bad. We are to deal with things rather than with names, and the Republican party is the natural descendant and true heir of the old Whig party, as the Whig party was the descendant of the old Federalist party, whose founder was no other than Alexander Hamilton. Alexander Hamilton in the great constitutional convention presented a theory of government for the United States which to say the least of it was but a modified form of monarchy. He held to the idea that some persons naturally divided themselves into two classes; the one composed of the few—the rich and the well-born; the other class, was the masses—rude, turbulent and unsafe to be left alone. The ruler of government, unless you shall put checks and restraints upon them. He asked, therefore, that there should be given to the class composed of the rich and the well-born, the power to elect one branch of the government, and hence desired to see a government founded which should have an executive holding his position for life. He insisted that one branch of the government should be elected for life or during good behavior. The form of government presented by Hamilton was rejected. It is true, but the principle of it lived within him, and what he failed to obtain by direct enactment in the fundamental law, after the constitution was established, he undertook to bring into existence by indirect means, by construction, by liberal interpretation

of the powers ennumerated in the constitution. He knew as well as Jefferson knew that the natural tendency of things was for the government to increase its powers and for liberty to yield ground, being conscious of this he based upon it his hope of eventually creating such a government of which he had dreamed. The party founded by Jefferson became the party of strict construction of the constitution; while the party founded by Hamilton became the party of loose construction, or liberal and broad interpretation of the powers conferred upon the government which the constitution created.

It is a Republican, not a Democratic sentiment which says, "The Constitution is the constitution." I am credibly informed—and it is in line with my recollection of the circumstance—that such a remark was made by a Republican, not a Democratic Senator (applause.) But we shall best see these two theories of government interpreted by the conduct of the two parties in the exercise of the sovereign power of taxation vested in the government. Let me preface what I have to say upon that subject by calling your attention to how the two parties have interpreted the question of taxation. Taxation has been the battle field of liberty in all ages of the world. It is a field that has been crossed and recrossed by the people contending for their liberties on the one hand, and by the mercenary hirelings of arbitrary powers on the other. You remember that when the Magna Charta of England was presented to King John by the barons, in the pleasant meadows of Runnymede, the first clause in the great charter made this declaration: "You shall not tax us against our will." The king would not refuse to sign the immortal document had he dared, but he found himself surrounded by stern men of fixed purpose and as he looked in the determined faces there was nothing left for the coward king to do but to sign that document. Later, when the great conflict for liberty was transferred from the old world to the shores of the new, the battle for freedom was again fought out upon the question of taxation. The sons of liberty in this land said to the king of England, "You shall not tax us against our will." We have no representation in parliament." "No taxation without representation," became their battle cry, and upon that issue the colonies won their freedom. (Applause.) Today the question has changed form, but in substance it is the same. Today the great party that stands for popular rights and equal laws says to the government: "You shall not tax us to foster private industries, and build up private fortunes for public purposes, and we must know that the tax is necessary and the purpose a proper one." (Applause.)

With this preface, then, to the subject of taxation, let us now inquire into the theories of the two parties in relation to it. The Democratic idea is embodied in this sentence. The government has no right to exercise the sovereign power of collecting revenue, limited to the necessities of the government when the government is economically administered. The Republican theory of taxation is, that the sovereign power may be exercised to foster private industries and to build up private fortunes, under the plea of giving an instance to the world. (Applause.) When the Democratic statesman makes out his tariff schedules he has his eye single to the accomplishment of one purpose, and that is, how much revenue does the government require? With this single purpose in mind, when he comes to view the articles upon which taxation shall be fixed, he is at liberty to place the heaviest burden of taxation upon luxuries, and when the heaviest burdens of taxation are placed upon the luxuries we import, as a necessary consequence those who

consume the luxuries have the heaviest burden of taxation to bear; and it is right that it should be so, for then the heaviest burden rests upon the wealthy, who consume the luxuries, and thus wealth and not want is taxed. (Applause.) The Democratic statesman, then, is at liberty to place his tax upon luxuries; that is, the heaviest burden of taxation on luxuries, for I hold that all should bear their proportion, but the heaviest burden should be placed upon the shoulders best able to carry it—upon the wealthy. In addition to this advantage there is another. Democrats have been in favor of taxing not only the luxuries imported into our country, but also the luxuries that are produced at home, especially those luxuries the consumption of which is held to be injurious to the individual and to society—hence they favor a tax on such articles as whisky, beer, tobacco, and I think also oleomargarine. Before the enactment of the McKinley bill, the taxation on these articles brought to the government about \$10,000,000. A new feature of taxation has recently been introduced by Democrats. They have placed a tax of 2 per cent on annual income. Four thousand dollars per annum is held to be a comfortable income; that is there are a family who, their homes, consume \$4,000 per annum; and when they do that of course what they expend is taxed in common with that which we expend in articles purchased upon the market. This is a new feature of families are few who consume more than \$4,000 per annum, and when a man's income is more than that upon that excess of wealth the Democratic party have thought it proper to place an income tax of 2 per cent, per annum, so that wealth again as well as want may bear the burdens of taxation. (Applause.) You will observe also that this is in line with other features of the Democratic system of taxation.

Now I come to the Republican theory of taxation. When a Republican statesman makes up his tariff schedules, his eye is fixed not upon the amount of revenue necessary for the government but how much is needed to give protection to our home industries. He loses sight of the revenue necessary for the government, and estimates how much is needed for protection, and hence when he comes to his tariff schedules he is compelled to place the heaviest burden of taxation upon the goods which are of prime necessity in the consumption of the people, for the reason that the chief necessities of life are the things which are taxed. He is going to give protection to our industries he must place the heaviest per cent of taxation upon those things that come in competition with what we produce, and they are things that enter into the daily consumption of the people, and the heaviest burdens of taxation are placed upon the shoulders least able to bear them—upon the masses, upon the poor. (Applause.) And it not infrequently happens that the man who obtains his daily bread by daily toil, pass an equal burden of taxes with the man who is wealthy. In order that you may have the assurance that I am not mistaken in what I say upon this subject, I will give you an instance. You know the McKinley bill, which will show the results of Republican taxation. Take the article of seal skin sacs; those people who can pay all the way from \$200 up to \$800 a piece for them; it is the wives, daughters and sisters men who can pay such prices that buy seal skin sacs. The McKinley bill reduced the tax on this class of goods 33 per cent, but on imitation seal skin sacs, which you can purchase all the way from \$12, \$25, \$30, to \$50 and you know who purchase such sacs as that—upon those sacs the duty was advanced 120 per

cent. (Applause.) Silk linings, such as line the clothing of the rich, the McKinley bill made no advance on the duty on that article; but on cotton linings, such lining as enters into the lining of my coat and of yours, the duty was advanced 25 per cent. (Applause.) In silk velvets there was no advance, but in cotton velvets such as common folks have to put up with, the advance was 100 per cent. Silk laces for a wonder were advanced 20 per cent, but woolen socks, 120 per cent. And so I might go on and show you that you would only know the same facts, viz: that the Republican system of taxation places the heaviest burden upon the goods that enter into the common consumption of the people; I think what I have called your attention to is sufficient to prove that.

There are other things connected with these two systems of taxation: Whenever the Democrat fixes his tariff schedule to secure the necessary revenue for the government, the revenue is kept more nearly to the amount necessary than when fixed by the Republican system of taxation, since revenue is not its purpose, often transpires that the revenue is in excess of the amount needed to meet the proper expenses of government, and at other times the income is far below the amount needed, and am not dealing with theories in relation to this matter. Recent history of the United States will demonstrate the truth of what I say. When President Cleveland's first administration was drawing to a close, he called the attention of the country and of Congress, by a special message, to the fact that there was accumulating in the treasury vaults of the United States treasury nearly 100 million dollars per annum more than was necessary to meet the legitimate expenses of the government. There it was piling up in the treasury inviting jobbery and corruption, a menace to honest government. President Cleveland recommended that the evil be met by a reduction of tariff taxation, a most sensible recommendation it seems to me. His method of remedying the evil was to take less and less from the people. It is said that the message of 1883 cost President Cleveland the election that year; but if it cost him the election in 1883, it would cost him the election in 1892. (Applause.)

When the Harrison administration closed, the outgoing secretary, Mr. Foster, made a report to a committee of investigation that was a part of the government comfortably there was needed about fifty million dollars more per annum. Now what does that mean? It means that our Republican friends had not only gotten rid of the surplus of about 100 million dollars left by the Cleveland administration, but they had created a deficit in the treasury accounts of about fifty million dollars. In order that the actual deficit might not appear, the government authorized the transfer to the credit balance of the treasury report fifty-four million dollars trust fund deposited by national banks, and the redemption of their notes, and twenty million dollars of subsidiary coin which up to that time had never been counted as credit balance of the treasury report. And thus the Harrison administration was able to show a deficit in the treasury, but the deficit was there nevertheless. It will be seen, therefore, that under a Democratic administration the necessities of the government about 100 million dollars per annum; but under a Republican administration the revenue fell about fifty million dollars below what was necessary to meet the expenses of the government; and hence the necessity of the criticism I am making upon that subject. Why, in the way, I imagine that some of my Republican friends will be telling me that this objection is easily overcome by declaring that the tariff is not a tax; or, if it is a tax, then it is paid by the foreigner. I have a little experience, at least upon observation, on this subject. How does one returning from England, a friend of mine thought, he would bring a silk dress home to his wife, and when he appeared in his custom house office in New York with his package, the custom house officer met him, took the valuation and told him that the duty on it was \$13 and some cents. He looked around for the foreigner to pay the tax but he was not there. (Applause.) Of course you will tell me that this man stood in the same position that the foreigner does, and that he paid the tax and had been a foreigner; the foreigner would pay the tax. Why how easy an explanation that is! But suppose the man in this case was going to sell the goods again, do you suppose that he would sell them upon the cost price of the article in England, or would he, when he got the goods this side of the United States line, add the tariff of \$13 to the first cost and then sell them on the basis of the price in England plus what he paid in tariff? I rather think he would take the latter course.

Take another illustration of this matter. Suppose a merchant in New York or San Francisco ship goods to America to these cities. If you will go there you will find that these importing merchants are not doing business with Americans, and the manner in which they conduct their business, for the most part, is to send their agents direct to the manufacturers, and make the purchase of said goods direct of the manufacturers, and ship them to some seaport, and thence to New York, Boston or other ports of entry. The goods at the factory we will say cost \$100,000. When they arrive at a port of entry the importers are met by a custom officer who takes a valuation of the cargo and tells them that the duty amounts to \$40,000. Now when the importing merchant comes to sell those goods to the wholesale merchant he will sell them to him upon the basis that they cost him just \$100,000; or he will add the \$40,000 tariff duty which he paid and tell the wholesale merchant that he will sell them to him at an increased price. And let me say here, in passing, that in England, France or Germany the competition in these countries is so keen that it is so great that they cannot afford to sell to foreigners 50 per cent cheaper than they sell to their own people. That is a privilege enjoyed only in this blessed land of America. (Applause.) But to return to our illustration, the whole sale merchant takes the goods and he sells them with this increased price by reason of the tariff still sticking to them; and in the increased price that you pay for your goods you, my friends, pay the tariff tax upon them. (Applause.)

But for the benefit of my Republican friends I am going to read an authority upon this subject of the tariff being paid by the consumer. I am going to read what the Republican present will question the statement on this subject of the great William McKinley. I will read to you what he said, I think in an unguarded moment, perhaps of the Report of the Ways and Means committee, of which he was chairman, he himself making the report. When Congress was about to act upon the McKinley bill he said this—and I pray you pay attention to the language—when he came to the sugar schedule of the tariff, he said:

"So large a portion of our sugar is imported that the home production of sugar does not materially affect the price, and the duty is, therefore, a tax which is added to the price, not only of the imported but of the domestic product." That is what we have been trying to tell the people of the United States for some time. Now we have a proposition before us upon which we may work out the Republican theory of taxation under the protection of the tariff. When an article consumed in the United States is not produced here at all, and it is imported, the duty paid upon it is a tax—according to Mr. McKinley's definition of a tax, a tax which is added to the price, not only of the imported but of the domestic product. When the article consumed in the United States is partly imported from abroad and partly produced at home, then the duty is also a tax, according to Mr. McKinley's definition of the article and paid by the consumer. When the article consumed in the United States is partly imported from abroad and partly produced at home, then the duty is also a tax, according to Mr. McKinley's definition of the article and paid by the consumer. When the article consumed in the United States is partly imported from abroad and partly produced at home, then the duty is also a tax, according to Mr. McKinley's definition of the article and paid by the consumer.

Are You Aware

That we are Headquarters for all kinds of Staple and Fancy Groceries? If not call and examine our well selected stock and be convinced we have always the

Newest, Nicest and Freshest of Everything in the Market at Prices Lower than the Lowest.

W. S. Henderson, THE CASH GROCER.

moment perchance on the subject. I have been from page 9 of the Report of the Ways and Means committee, of which he was chairman, he himself making the report. When Congress was about to act upon the McKinley bill he said this—and I pray you pay attention to the language—when he came to the sugar schedule of the tariff, he said:

"So large a portion of our sugar is imported that the home production of sugar does not materially affect the price, and the duty is, therefore, a tax which is added to the price, not only of the imported but of the domestic product." That is what we have been trying to tell the people of the United States for some time. Now we have a proposition before us upon which we may work out the Republican theory of taxation under the protection of the tariff. When an article consumed in the United States is not produced here at all, and it is imported, the duty paid upon it is a tax—according to Mr. McKinley's definition of a tax, a tax which is added to the price, not only of the imported but of the domestic product. When the article consumed in the United States is partly imported from abroad and partly produced at home, then the duty is also a tax, according to Mr. McKinley's definition of the article and paid by the consumer. When the article consumed in the United States is partly imported from abroad and partly produced at home, then the duty is also a tax, according to Mr. McKinley's definition of the article and paid by the consumer.

It is about time that a statesmanship should arise in our country that would not forever hold in its eye the few and neglect the many. I want to illustrate if I can how this protective or tariff system works. I can best make the point by an anecdote. A minister had a son that he was very anxious should grow up in the faith of the existence of the deity, and one of his methods of argument was to call his son's attention to the works of nature and to the evidences of design in them—hence the existence of one Sabbath morning when he and his son were walking upon the shores of a shallow lake, he observed a stork wading about near the shore. He called his son's attention to the construction of the bird and how it had long slim legs and when it drew its foot out of the water involuntarily the muscles contracted and the fish designed neck darted out and the stork caught a fish. The minister clasped his hands for joy and said:

"Behold my son, see the fitness of the design in the construction of the stork!" The son said, "Yes, father, that designing business seems to be all right for the stork, but how about the fish? Why does not the fish designed neck dart out and the stork catch a fish. The minister clasped his hands for joy and said:

"Behold my son, see the fitness of the design in the construction of the stork!" The son said, "Yes, father, that designing business seems to be all right for the stork, but how about the fish? Why does not the fish designed neck dart out and the stork catch a fish. The minister clasped his hands for joy and said:

"Behold my son, see the fitness of the design in the construction of the stork!" The son said, "Yes, father, that designing business seems to be all right for the stork, but how about the fish? Why does not the fish designed neck dart out and the stork catch a fish. The minister clasped his hands for joy and said:

"Behold my son, see the fitness of the design in the construction of the stork!" The son said, "Yes, father, that designing business seems to be all right for the stork, but how about the fish? Why does not the fish designed neck dart out and the stork catch a fish. The minister clasped his hands for joy and said:

THE FEATURES OF THE COMING WEEK.

- First--The great view of the Hosiery Cheapness.
Second--The great view of the Underwear Cheapness.
Third--The great view of the Umbrella Cheapness.
Fourth--The great view of the Sleeping Garment Cheapness.
Fifth--The great view of the Ladies' Skirt Cheapness.

ALL IN THE BUSY THIRD AND FOURTH AISLES.

A marked week was LAST WEEK in the Black Silk Business. We continue it for another week, all the popular weaves, Peau de Soies, Failles, Bengalines, Crystals, Gros Grains, Taffatas, Surahs, and Fancies.

N. B.--We will guarantee to match any piece of Black Silk purchased elsewhere in this city for 25 per cent less than your purchase price. Bring in your samples. Every customer protected as to wear who buys at this sale.

LADIES' HOSIERY.

We will not say what they are reduced from, but during this Hosiery Sale you can buy, for the coming week, a few numbers in ladies' and children's hose at 33 1-3 per cent less than ever before.
100 doz. ladies' fast black, heavy winter weight, extra long, all sizes; thick of it, they are fleece-lined hose, will be on the counter, third aisle, at 10c. pr.
50 doz. ladies' fast black, fleece-lined, regular made, absolutely seamless, extra weight and length. You could not ask for a better fleece-lined hose. Truly they are worth twice what the price will be Monday, 25c. pr.
We will sell 50 doz. ladies' full sized fast black, also seamless ribbed woolen hose the price will sell this number in three days. Our former sale price is now 174c. pr.

Only 25 doz. cashmere hose, Men's fine quality, pure wool and seamless, extra length; 50c. was the price six months ago, Monday, in that busy hosiery department, 25c. pr.

100 doz. the new Estey patent (don't fail to see them) ladies' fast black hose, Burlington & Hermsdorf dye, does not crack or turn green, absolutely free from all poisonous substances, full fashioned; we will compare them with the best 30c. hose you ever purchased. Sale price will be three pairs for half a dollar, or 17 1-2c. pr.

AN UNDERWEAR STORY WITH MANY CHAPTERS.

This will be a delightful place to visit Monday, also 3d Aisle.

LADIES' UNDERWEAR.

We will offer on Monday a very large quantity of excellent Jersey ribbed vests and drawers, splendid weight, in all sizes, at 25c.
And offer 35 doz. ladies' heavy fleece-lined balbrigan and natural vests and drawers, with splendid finish, for the week, only 50c.
Also 35 doz. ladies' extra heavy Merino natural vests and drawers, with silk finish, at 60c.
To crowd the 3d Aisle on Monday we'll give you all you want of the \$1.50 Munsing Plated Ladies' Vests and drawers, cotton and wool, non-shrinking, finished seams, jersey fitting, naturally white. You will quickly recognize them as the \$1.50 goods, but Monday only 1.00.
There will be two tremendous views in Combination Suits.
No. 1. Don't miss getting one suit anyway. 200 dozen Ladies' elegant balbrigan and natural Jersey ribbed Combination suits, with silk finish, stacked upon the counter at 8:30 sharp Monday morning at 60c. suit.
If Monday don't clean out every 60c. Combination suit we will miss our guess.

At the same counter on Monday you can buy ladies' fleece-lined balbrigan Combination Suits with ribbon finish in winter weight, at 90c. suit.

LADIES' FALL AND WINTER SKIRTS.

Just one leader, this is for three days only, the skirt will go at the price of making alone. 150 ladies' fast black French Satin Skirts, flannelette lined throughout, finished with a 4-inch box plaiting. They will be in the crowded Fourth Aisle at 1.40.
Monday in Fourth Aisle you can buy Boys' Sleeping Garments in heavy canton flannel, with four pockets for 75c.
Monday in the Fourth Aisle you can buy the best and Gloria Silk Umbrella, paragon frame, natural stick, ever saw—Don't miss it—for 1.10.
Monday in the Fourth Aisle you can buy for the little girl lovely India Linen Aprons, waist neatly trimmed with ruffles and leather-stitch braid, sizes from 12 to 12 years, at 75c.

CHILDREN'S HOSIERY.

HERE IS THE BARGAIN OF BARGAINS.

300 doz. Children's FLEECE-LINED WATER RIBBED HOSE, warranted stainless (don't forget it), sizes from 5 to 8-12, no distinction in price as to the size, the baby pays as much as the large girl in the busy hosiery corner. Monday, 10c. pr.

We repeat, the above child's hosiery item at 10c. per pair is the wonder of hosiery bargains during our business experience. Also remember there will be no limit to quantity. You can have all you want. This is a splendid chance for the needy, 300 doz., two cases, and fleece-lined. 50 doz. children's pure wool ribbed hose, sizes from 7 to 8-12, will go at the astounding price of 16c. pr.

Here is the Never-Wear-Out, 40 doz. boys' and girls' extra heavy winter weight woolen hose, in fine and wide rib, double knees, heels and toes, extra length and elastic at the small end to the largest. A world better. 25c. pr.

Children's underwear not forgotten. Look at the sizes, look at the prices. Heavy merino vests and pants. 15 15 20 22 24 25 26 30 32 34 .10 .12 .15 .20 .22 .25 30 .35 .40 .45

B--sure and get your winter supply at this time, as it cannot be had later.

WALKER BROS. & FYLE CO.